



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/501,150	07/13/2004	Syuji Matsuda	2004_1091A	5201
513 7590 04/19/2010 WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK, L.L.P. 1030 15th Street, N.W., Suite 400 East Washington, DC 20005-1503				
EXAMINER TORRES, JOSEPH D				
ART UNIT 2112		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 04/19/2010		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ddalecki@wenderoth.com
coa@wenderoth.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/501,150

Applicant(s)

MATSUDA ET AL.

Examiner

Joseph D. Torres

Art Unit

2112

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 February 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 17-26, 37 and 38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 17-26, 37 and 38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 July 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-506)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 02/18/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Applicant contends, "In particular, Applicants note that while Marchant discloses the use of erasure flags, that Marchant does not disclose the use of error position information. In this regard, Applicants note that an "erasure flag" is information that indicates whether an error is present at a certain position, whereas "error position information" is information that indicates the position of an error in the code by itself".

There are at least two errors in the previous argument, the first being, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *IN RE KELLER*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *IN RE MERCK & CO.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (FED. CIR. 1986). Col. 6, line 51 to col. 7, line 9 and Figure 5 in Nakamura teaches that during C1 inner decoding error location/position polynomials are generated in Block 3 and are used to generate feedback information to generate erasure information in Blocks 7, 7(b), 7(c) and 8. Specifically, col. 7, lines 2-5 in Nakamura teaches that error locations of the C1 inner/row error location/position polynomial are converted to erasure locations to be used in C2 outer/column error correction decoding whenever uncorrectable-error flags

are output to Blocks 7, 7(b), 7(c) and 8, that is; the erasure position/location information stored in Block 8 is obtained from a error/position polynomial).

The second error derives from the argument itself: col. 3, lines 41-59 in Marchant teaches that C1 inner codeword rows exceeding error correction capabilities are flagged. An erasure flagged row within a C2 column outer code codeword is a position of an erroneous symbol within the C2 column outer code codeword. Hence, the erasure flag in Marchant provides error position information for a symbol within a C2 column/outer code codeword.

The Applicant contends, "Thus, because Marchant only discloses the use of erasure flags, Applicants respectfully submit that even if Nakamura (which the Examiner has relied on for the teaching of erasure position/location information that is obtained from an error/position polynomial) was combined with Marchant, that the erasure flags of Marchant could not be transformed so as to be obtained from a position polynomial".

The Examiner disagrees and asserts col. 6, line 61 to col. 7, line 8 in Nakamura teach that error locations of the C1 inner/row error location/position polynomial are converted to erasure locations to be used in C2 outer/column error correction decoding whenever uncorrectable-error flags are output to Blocks 7, 7(b), 7(c) and 8, which is substantially what is already taught in Marchant. Col. 6, line 6-17 of Marchant clearly suggests the use of a Reed-Solomon Erasure code. Nakamura teaches that in Reed-Solomon Erasure decoding erasures are erasure flagged during C1 inner/row code decoding just as in Marchant. However, Nakamura provides details missing in Marchant as to how

erasure flagging is executed. Col. 6, line 51 to col. 7, line 9 and Figure 5 in Nakamura teaches that during C1 inner decoding error location/position polynomials are generated in Block 3 and are used to generate feedback information to generate erasure information in Blocks 7, 7(b), 7(c) and 8. Specifically, col. 7, lines 2-5 in Nakamura teaches that error locations of the C1 inner/row error location/position polynomial are converted to erasure locations to be used in C2 outer/column error correction decoding whenever uncorrectable-error flags are output to Blocks 7, 7(b), 7(c) and 8, that is; the erasure position/location information stored in Block 8 is obtained from a error/position polynomial).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 17, 19, 20, 22, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marchant; Alan B. (US 6631492 B2) in further view of Nakamura; Takahiko et al. (US 5684810 A, hereafter referred to as Nakamura) and Kobayashi; Hisashi et al. (US 6029264 A, hereafter referred to as Kobayashi; Note: Kobayashi is used strictly as a teaching reference).

Summary of the teachings in Marchant:

Col. 3, lines 30-59 in Marchant teaches using ECC product codeword to correct burst errors due to scratches. Figures 6 and 7 in Marchant teaches how the ECC product codeword of Figure 5 lines up with scratches on a recording media prior to being read and processed to recover the stored data. Note: Col. 4, lines 41-60 in Marchant teaches that the recorded code is a cross interleaved code so that Figures 5-7 shows how the inner codewords line up with scratches on a recording media prior to being read and processed to recover the stored data. Kobayashi is used as a teaching reference for a cross interleaved code. Figure 2 in the Kobayashi teaching reference teaches that a cross interleaved codeword is generated by scrambling/interleaving an outer codeword and inner encoding the scrambled/interleaved outer codeword to generate an inner codewords as shown in Figure 5-6 of Marchant. Figure 2 in Kobayashi teaches that deinterleaving occurs after inner decoding a cross interleaved codeword.

35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claims 17 and 22:

Marchant teaches an error correction method for an error correction code (ECC) block that includes Reed-Solomon-coded data said error correction method using a plurality of bytes of sub data which comprise error correction codes that are independent from error correction codes of an error correction target code line to configure erasure position information (col. 3, lines 30-59 in Marchant teaches using a plurality of pieces of inner/row codeword sub data which comprise error correction codes that are independent from error correction codes of an outer/column error correction target code line to configure erasure position information; Note: col. 3, lines 41-57 in Marchant teaches that inner/row codeword sub data of the product code is used to configure erasure position information),

the plurality of bytes of sub data including at least a first byte of sub data and a second byte of sub data (Figure 7 of Marchant teaches that the plurality of bytes of sub data include at least a first byte of sub data 48b in inner/row codeword sub data row 3 of Figure 7 and a second byte of sub data 48a in inner/row codeword sub data row 3), said error correction method comprising:

judging whether or not a first byte of main data, which is one of a plurality of bytes of main data of the error correction target code line, and a second byte of main data, which is one of a plurality of bytes of main data of a previous error correction code line, were located between the first and second bytes of sub data before being deinterleaved (col. 6, lines 28-56 in Marchant teach judging whether or not a first piece of data 48b in inner/row codeword sub data row 3 of Figure 7, which is one of a plurality of pieces of data of the outer/column error correction target code line 44b, and a second piece of

data 48a in inner/row codeword sub data row 3, which is one of a plurality of pieces of data of a previous error correction code line 44a, were located between the same pieces of inner/row codeword sub data rows 2 to 4 before being deinterleaving; Note: Col. 4, lines 41-60 in Marchant teaches that the recorded code is a cross interleaved code so that Figures 5-7 shows how the inner codewords line up with scratches on a recording media prior to being read and processed to recover the stored data hence prior to being de-interleaved); configuring erasure position information of said first byte of main data belonging to the error correction target code line to be identical to erasure position information of said second byte of main data belonging to the previous error correction code line when said judging judges that the first byte of main data and the second byte of main data were both located between the first and second bytes of sub data before being deinterleaved (col. 6, lines 28-56 in Marchant teach that symbols in a scratch field are configured/flagged with erasure information for a scratch so that they are configured/flagged with erasure position information for the same scratch, in particular; this process is a step for configuring/flagging erasure position information of said first piece of data 48b belonging to the outer/column error correction target code line 44b to be the same as identical row position 3 to erasure position information of said second piece of data 48a belonging to the previous error correction code line 44a when said judgment step judging judges that the first piece of data 48b and the second piece of data 48a are both located between the same pieces of inner/row codeword sub data rows 2 to 4), the erasure position information being obtained at a time of performing Reed-Solomon decoding on the Reed-Solomon-coded data (Col. 3, lines 41-

47 in Marchant teaches that configuring/flagging with erasure position information occurs during inner decoding; Note: in cross interleaved codewords, inner decoding occurs before deinterleaving, e.g., Figure 2 in the Kobayashi teaching reference); and performing error correction on the error correction target code line (col. 6, lines 28-56 in Marchant).

As per additional limitations in claim 22: Col. 3, lines 41-47 in Marchant teaches that configuring/flagging with erasure position information occurs during inner decoding prior to de-interleaving.

However Marchant does not explicitly teach the specific use of erasure position information being obtained from a position polynomial. Note: col. 3, lines 41-59 in Marchant teaches that C1 inner codeword rows exceeding error correction capabilities are flagged. An erasure flagged row within a C2 column outer code codeword is a position of an erroneous symbol within the C2 column outer code codeword. Hence, the erasure flag in Marchant provides error position information for a symbol within a C2 column/outer code codeword.

Nakamura, in an analogous art, teaches the erasure position information being obtained from a position polynomial (Col. 6, line 51 to col. 7, line 9 and Figure 5 in Nakamura teaches that during C1 inner decoding error location/position polynomials are generated in Block 3 and are used to generate feedback information to generate erasure information in Blocks 7, 7(b), 7(c) and 8; Specifically, col. 7, lines 2-5 in Nakamura teaches that error locations of the C1 inner/row error location/position polynomial are converted to erasure locations to be used in C2 outer/column

error correction decoding whenever uncorrectable-error flags are output to Blocks 7, 7(b), 7(c) and 8, that is; the erasure position/location information stored in Block 8 is obtained from a error/position polynomial).

In summary, col. 6, line 61 to col. 7, line 8 in Nakamura teach that error locations of the C1 inner/row error location/position polynomial are converted to erasure locations to be used in C2 outer/column error correction decoding whenever uncorrectable-error flags are output to Blocks 7, 7(b), 7(c) and 8, which is substantially what is already taught in Marchant. Col. 6, line 6-17 of Marchant clearly suggests the use of a Reed-Solomon Erasure code. Nakamura teaches that in Reed-Solomon Erasure decoding erasures are erasure flagged during C1 inner/row code decoding just as in Marchant. However, Nakamura provides details missing in Marchant as to how erasure flagging is executed. Col. 6, line 51 to col. 7, line 9 and Figure 5 in Nakamura teaches that during C1 inner decoding error location/position polynomials are generated in Block 3 and are used to generate feedback information to generate erasure information in Blocks 7, 7(b), 7(c) and 8. Specifically, col. 7, lines 2-5 in Nakamura teaches that error locations of the C1 inner/row error location/position polynomial are converted to erasure locations to be used in C2 outer/column error correction decoding whenever uncorrectable-error flags are output to Blocks 7, 7(b), 7(c) and 8, that is; the erasure position/location information stored in Block 8 is obtained from a error/position polynomial).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Marchant with the teachings of Nakamura by including use of erasure position information being obtained from a position polynomial. This modification would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, because one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that use of erasure position information being obtained from a position polynomial would have provided a means for obtaining erasure information for inner C1 uncorrectable errors (col. 6, line 51 to col. 7, line 9 and Figure 5 in Nakamura).

35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claims 19 and 24:

Marchant teaches an error correction method for an error correction code (ECC) block that includes Reed-Solomon-coded data said error correction method using a plurality of bytes of sub data which comprise error correction codes that are independent from error correction codes of an error correction target code line to configure erasure position information (col. 3, lines 30-59 in Marchant teaches using a plurality of pieces of inner/row codeword sub data which comprise error correction codes that are independent from error correction codes of an outer/column error correction target code line to configure erasure position information; Note: col. 3, lines 41-57 in Marchant teaches that inner/row codeword sub data of the product code is used to configure erasure position information), the plurality of bytes of sub data including at least a first byte of sub data and a second byte of sub data (Figure 7 of Marchant teaches that the plurality of bytes of sub data

include at least a first byte of sub data 48b in inner/row codeword sub data row 3 of Figure 7 and a second byte of sub data 48a in inner/row codeword sub data row 3), said error correction method comprising:

judging whether or not a first byte of main data, which is one of a plurality of bytes of main data of the error correction target code line, and a second byte of main data, which is one of a plurality of bytes of main data of a previous error correction code line, were located between the first and second bytes of sub data before being deinterleaved (col. 6, lines 28-56 in Marchant teach judging whether or not a first piece of data 48b in inner/row codeword sub data row 3 of Figure 7, which is one of a plurality of pieces of data of the outer/column error correction target code line 44b, and a second piece of data 48a in inner/row codeword sub data row 3, which is one of a plurality of pieces of data of a previous error correction code line 44a, were located between the same pieces of inner/row codeword sub data rows 2 to 4 before being deinterleaving; Note: Col. 4, lines 41-60 in Marchant teaches that the recorded code is a cross interleaved code so that Figures 5-7 shows how the inner codewords line up with scratches on a recording media prior to being read and processed to recover the stored data hence prior to being de-interleaved); configuring erasure position information of said first byte of main data belonging to the error correction target code line to be identical to erasure position information of said second byte of main data belonging to the previous error correction code line when said judging judges that the first byte of main data and the second byte of main data were both located between the first and second bytes of sub data before being deinterleaved (col. 6, lines 28-56 in Marchant teach that symbols in a

scratch field are configured/flagged with erasure information for a scratch so that they are configured/flagged with erasure position information for the same scratch, in particular; this process is a step for configuring/flagging erasure position information of said first piece of data 48b belonging to the outer/column error correction target code line 44b to be the same as identical row position 3 to erasure position information of said second piece of data 48a belonging to the previous error correction code line 44a when said judgment step judging judges that the first piece of data 48b and the second piece of data 48a are both located between the same pieces of inner/row codeword sub data rows 2 to 4), the erasure position information being obtained at a time of performing Reed-Solomon decoding on the Reed-Solomon-coded data (Col. 3, lines 41-47 in Marchant teaches that configuring/flagging with erasure position information occurs during inner decoding; Note: in cross interleaved codewords, inner decoding occurs before deinterleaving, e.g., Figure 2 in the Kobayashi teaching reference); and performing error correction on the error correction target code line (col. 6, lines 28-56 in Marchant).

As per additional limitations in claim 24: Col. 3, lines 41-47 in Marchant teaches that configuring/flagging with erasure position information occurs during inner decoding prior to de-interleaving.

However Marchant does not explicitly teach the specific use of erasure position information being obtained from a position polynomial. **Note: col. 3, lines 41-59 in Marchant teaches that C1 inner codeword rows exceeding error correction capabilities are flagged. An erasure flagged row within a C2 column outer code**

codeword is a position of an erroneous symbol within the C2 column outer code codeword. Hence, the erasure flag in Marchant provides error position information for a symbol within a C2 column/outer code codeword.

Nakamura, in an analogous art, teaches the erasure position information being obtained from a position polynomial (Col. 6, line 51 to col. 7, line 9 and Figure 5 in Nakamura teaches that during C1 inner decoding error location/position polynomials are generated in Block 3 and are used to generate feedback information to generate erasure information in Blocks 7, 7(b), 7(c) and 8; Specifically, col. 7, lines 2-5 in Nakamura teaches that error locations of the C1 inner/row error location/position polynomial are converted to erasure locations to be used in C2 outer/column error correction decoding whenever uncorrectable-error flags are output to Blocks 7, 7(b), 7(c) and 8, that is; the erasure position/location information stored in Block 8 is obtained from a error/position polynomial).

In summary, col. 6, line 61 to col. 7, line 8 in Nakamura teach that error locations of the C1 inner/row error location/position polynomial are converted to erasure locations to be used in C2 outer/column error correction decoding whenever uncorrectable-error flags are output to Blocks 7, 7(b), 7(c) and 8, which is substantially what is already taught in Marchant. Col. 6, line 6-17 of Marchant clearly suggests the use of a Reed-Solomon Erasure code. Nakamura teaches that in Reed-Solomon Erasure decoding erasures are erasure flagged during C1 inner/row code decoding just as in Marchant. However, Nakamura provides details missing in Marchant as to how erasure flagging is executed. Col. 6, line

51 to col. 7, line 9 and Figure 5 in Nakamura teaches that during C1 inner decoding error location/position polynomials are generated in Block 3 and are used to generate feedback information to generate erasure information in Blocks 7, 7(b), 7(c) and 8. Specifically, col. 7, lines 2-5 in Nakamura teaches that error locations of the C1 inner/row error location/position polynomial are converted to erasure locations to be used in C2 outer/column error correction decoding whenever uncorrectable-error flags are output to Blocks 7, 7(b), 7(c) and 8, that is; the erasure position/location information stored in Block 8 is obtained from a error/position polynomial).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Marchant with the teachings of Nakamura by including use of erasure position information being obtained from a position polynomial. This modification would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, because one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that use of erasure position information being obtained from a position polynomial would have provided a means for obtaining erasure information for inner C1 uncorrectable errors (col. 6, line 51 to col. 7, line 9 and Figure 5 in Nakamura).

Sub data 48a and 48b in Figure 7 of Marchant is sync data for configuring/flagging erasures.

35 U.S.C. 102(e) rejection of claims 20 and 25.

If first data is outside of sub data 48a and 48b in Figured 7 of Marchant, then it does not exist within sub data 48a and 48b.

Claims 18, 23, 37 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marchant; Alan B. (US 6631492 B2) in further view of Nakamura; Takahiko et al. (US 5684810 A, hereafter referred to as Nakamura) and Kobayashi; Hisashi et al. (US 6029264 A, hereafter referred to as Kobayashi; Note: Kobayashi is used strictly as a teaching reference) in further view of Shutoku; Toshiyuki et al. (US 7089401 B2, hereafter referred to as Shutoku).

35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claims 18 and 23.

Marchant teaches an error correction method for an error correction code (ECC) block that includes Reed-Solomon-coded data said error correction method using a plurality of bytes of sub data which comprise error correction codes that are independent from error correction codes of an error correction target code line to configure erasure position information (col. 3, lines 30-59 in Marchant teaches using a plurality of pieces of inner/row codeword sub data which comprise error correction codes that are independent from error correction codes of an outer/column error correction target code line to configure erasure position information; Note: col. 3, lines 41-57 in Marchant teaches that inner/row codeword sub data of the product code is used to configure erasure position information),

the plurality of bytes of sub data including at least a first byte of sub data and a second byte of sub data (Figure 7 of Marchant teaches that the plurality of bytes of sub data include at least a first byte of sub data 48b in inner/row codeword sub data row 3 of Figure 7 and a second byte of sub data 48a in inner/row codeword sub data row 3), said error correction method comprising:

judging whether or not a first byte of main data, which is one of a plurality of bytes of main data of the error correction target code line, and a second byte of main data, which is one of a plurality of bytes of main data of a previous error correction code line, were located between the first and second bytes of sub data before being deinterleaved (col. 6, lines 28-56 in Marchant teach judging whether or not a first piece of data 48b in inner/row codeword sub data row 3 of Figure 7, which is one of a plurality of pieces of data of the outer/column error correction target code line 44b, and a second piece of data 48a in inner/row codeword sub data row 3, which is one of a plurality of pieces of data of a previous error correction code line 44a, were located between the same pieces of inner/row codeword sub data rows 2 to 4 before being deinterleaving; Note: Col. 4, lines 41-60 in Marchant teaches that the recorded code is a cross interleaved code so that Figures 5-7 shows how the inner codewords line up with scratches on a recording media prior to being read and processed to recover the stored data hence prior to being de-interleaved); configuring erasure position information of said first byte of main data belonging to the error correction target code line to be identical to erasure position information of said second byte of main data belonging to the previous error correction code line when said judging judges that the first byte of main data and the

second byte of main data were both located between the first and second bytes of sub data before being deinterleaved (col. 6, lines 28-56 in Marchant teach that symbols in a scratch field are configured/flagged with erasure information for a scratch so that they are configured/flagged with erasure position information for the same scratch, in particular; this process is a step for configuring/flagging erasure position information of said first piece of data 48b belonging to the outer/column error correction target code line 44b to be the same as identical row position 3 to erasure position information of said second piece of data 48a belonging to the previous error correction code line 44a when said judgment step judging judges that the first piece of data 48b and the second piece of data 48a are both located between the same pieces of inner/row codeword sub data rows 2 to 4), the erasure position information being obtained at a time of performing Reed-Solomon decoding on the Reed-Solomon-coded data (Col. 3, lines 41-47 in Marchant teaches that configuring/flagging with erasure position information occurs during inner decoding; Note: in cross interleaved codewords, inner decoding occurs before deinterleaving, e.g., Figure 2 in the Kobayashi teaching reference); and performing error correction on the error correction target code line (col. 6, lines 28-56 in Marchant).

As per additional limitations in claim 23: Col. 3, lines 41-47 in Marchant teaches that configuring/flagging with erasure position information occurs during inner decoding prior to de-interleaving.

However Marchant does not explicitly teach the specific use of erasure position information being obtained from a position polynomial. **Note: col. 3, lines 41-59 in**

Marchant teaches that C1 inner codeword rows exceeding error correction capabilities are flagged. An erasure flagged row within a C2 column outer code codeword is a position of an erroneous symbol within the C2 column outer code codeword. Hence, the erasure flag in Marchant provides error position information for a symbol within a C2 column/outer code codeword.

Nakamura, in an analogous art, teaches the erasure position information being obtained from a position polynomial (Col. 6, line 51 to col. 7, line 9 and Figure 5 in Nakamura teaches that during C1 inner decoding error location/position polynomials are generated in Block 3 and are used to generate feedback information to generate erasure information in Blocks 7, 7(b), 7(c) and 8; Specifically, col. 7, lines 2-5 in Nakamura teaches that error locations of the C1 inner/row error location/position polynomial are converted to erasure locations to be used in C2 outer/column error correction decoding whenever uncorrectable-error flags are output to Blocks 7, 7(b), 7(c) and 8, that is: the erasure position/location information stored in Block 8 is obtained from a error/position polynomial).

In summary, col. 6, line 61 to col. 7, line 8 in Nakamura teach that error locations of the C1 inner/row error location/position polynomial are converted to erasure locations to be used in C2 outer/column error correction decoding whenever uncorrectable-error flags are output to Blocks 7, 7(b), 7(c) and 8, which is substantially what is already taught in Marchant. Col. 6, line 6-17 of Marchant clearly suggests the use of a Reed-Solomon Erasure code. Nakamura teaches that in Reed-Solomon Erasure decoding erasures are erasure flagged during C1

inner/row code decoding just as in Marchant. However, Nakamura provides details missing in Marchant as to how erasure flagging is executed. Col. 6, line 51 to col. 7, line 9 and Figure 5 in Nakamura teaches that during C1 inner decoding error location/position polynomials are generated in Block 3 and are used to generate feedback information to generate erasure information in Blocks 7, 7(b), 7(c) and 8. Specifically, col. 7, lines 2-5 in Nakamura teaches that error locations of the C1 inner/row error location/position polynomial are converted to erasure locations to be used in C2 outer/column error correction decoding whenever uncorrectable-error flags are output to Blocks 7, 7(b), 7(c) and 8, that is: the erasure position/location information stored in Block 8 is obtained from a error/position polynomial).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Marchant with the teachings of Nakamura by including use of erasure position information being obtained from a position polynomial. This modification would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, because one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that use of erasure position information being obtained from a position polynomial would have provided a means for obtaining erasure information for inner C1 uncorrectable errors (col. 6, line 51 to col. 7, line 9 and Figure 5 in Nakamura).

However Marchant does not explicitly teach the specific use of a typical DVD recording data structure as encompassed in the language "wherein the ECC block includes a plurality of main data areas comprising the plurality of bytes of main data of the error

correction target code line and the plurality of bytes of main data of the previous error correction target code line, and a plurality of sub data areas comprising the plurality of bytes of sub data, wherein the plurality of main data areas include a first main data area and a second main data area, wherein the plurality of sub data areas include: a first sub data area in which the first byte of sub data is located; a second sub data area in which the second byte of sub data is located; and a third sub data area in which a third byte of sub data is located, wherein the first main data area is disposed between the first sub data area and the second sub data area, wherein the second main data area is disposed between the second sub data area and the third sub data area wherein the second sub data area is disposed between the first main data area and the second main data area, and wherein said error correction target code line extends so as to be located in both of the first and second main data areas of the ECC block".

Shutoku, in an analogous art, teaches use of a typical DVD recording data structure as encompassed in the language "wherein the ECC block includes a plurality of main data areas comprising the plurality of bytes of main data of the error correction target code line and the plurality of bytes of main data of the previous error correction target code line, and a plurality of sub data areas comprising the plurality of bytes of sub data, wherein the plurality of main data areas include a first main data area and a second main data area, wherein the plurality of sub data areas include: a first sub data area in which the first byte of sub data is located; a second sub data area in which the second byte of sub data is located; and a third sub data area in which a third byte of sub data is located, wherein the first main data area is disposed between the first sub data area

and the second sub data area, wherein the second main data area is disposed between the second sub data area and the third sub data area wherein the second sub data area is disposed between the first main data area and the second main data area, and wherein said error correction target code line extends so as to be located in both of the first and second main data areas of the ECC block" (Figure 1-3 and col. 8, lines 52-55 in Shutoku).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Marchant with the teachings of Shutoku by including use of a typical DVD recording data structure as encompassed in the language "wherein the ECC block includes a plurality of main data areas comprising the plurality of bytes of main data of the error correction target code line and the plurality of bytes of main data of the previous error correction target code line, and a plurality of sub data areas comprising the plurality of bytes of sub data, wherein the plurality of main data areas include a first main data area and a second main data area, wherein the plurality of sub data areas include: a first sub data area in which the first byte of sub data is located; a second sub data area in which the second byte of sub data is located; and a third sub data area in which a third byte of sub data is located, wherein the first main data area is disposed between the first sub data area and the second sub data area, wherein the second main data area is disposed between the second sub data area and the third sub data area wherein the second sub data area is disposed between the first main data area and the second main data area, and wherein said error correction target code line extends so as to be located in both of the first and second main data areas of the ECC

block". This modification would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, because one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that use of a typical DVD recording data structure as encompassed in the language "wherein the ECC block includes a plurality of main data areas comprising the plurality of bytes of main data of the error correction target code line and the plurality of bytes of main data of the previous error correction target code line, and a plurality of sub data areas comprising the plurality of bytes of sub data, wherein the plurality of main data areas include a first main data area and a second main data area, wherein the plurality of sub data areas include: a first sub data area in which the first byte of sub data is located; a second sub data area in which the second byte of sub data is located; and a third sub data area in which a third byte of sub data is located, wherein the first main data area is disposed between the first sub data area and the second sub data area, wherein the second main data area is disposed between the second sub data area and the third sub data area wherein the second sub data area is disposed between the first main data area and the second main data area, and wherein said error correction target code line extends so as to be located in both of the first and second main data areas of the ECC block" would have provided scratch protection for DVDs.

35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claims 37 and 38.

Marchant teaches an error correction method for an error correction code (ECC) block that includes Reed-Solomon-coded data said error correction method using a plurality of bytes of sub data which comprise error correction codes that are independent from error

correction codes of an error correction target code line to configure erasure position information (col. 3, lines 30-59 in Marchant teaches using a plurality of pieces of inner/row codeword sub data which comprise error correction codes that are independent from error correction codes of an outer/column error correction target code line to configure erasure position information; Note: col. 3, lines 41-57 in Marchant teaches that inner/row codeword sub data of the product code is used to configure erasure position information),

the plurality of bytes of sub data including at least a first byte of sub data and a second byte of sub data (Figure 7 of Marchant teaches that the plurality of bytes of sub data include at least a first byte of sub data 48b in inner/row codeword sub data row 3 of Figure 7 and a second byte of sub data 48a in inner/row codeword sub data row 3), said error correction method comprising:

judging whether or not a first byte of main data, which is one of a plurality of bytes of main data of the error correction target code line, and a second byte of main data, which is one of a plurality of bytes of main data of a previous error correction code line, were located between the first and second bytes of sub data before being deinterleaved (col. 6, lines 28-56 in Marchant teach judging whether or not a first piece of data 48b in inner/row codeword sub data row 3 of Figure 7, which is one of a plurality of pieces of data of the outer/column error correction target code line 44b, and a second piece of data 48a in inner/row codeword sub data row 3, which is one of a plurality of pieces of data of a previous error correction code line 44a, were located between the same pieces of inner/row codeword sub data rows 2 to 4 before being deinterleaving; Note:

Col. 4, lines 41-60 in Marchant teaches that the recorded code is a cross interleaved code so that Figures 5-7 shows how the inner codewords line up with scratches on a recording media prior to being read and processed to recover the stored data hence prior to being de-interleaved); configuring erasure position information of said first byte of main data belonging to the error correction target code line to be identical to erasure position information of said second byte of main data belonging to the previous error correction code line when said judging judges that the first byte of main data and the second byte of main data were both located between the first and second bytes of sub data before being deinterleaved (col. 6, lines 28-56 in Marchant teach that symbols in a scratch field are configured/flagged with erasure information for a scratch so that they are configured/flagged with erasure position information for the same scratch, in particular; this process is a step for configuring/flagging erasure position information of said first piece of data 48b belonging to the outer/column error correction target code line 44b to be the same as identical row position 3 to erasure position information of said second piece of data 48a belonging to the previous error correction code line 44a when said judgment step judging judges that the first piece of data 48b and the second piece of data 48a are both located between the same pieces of inner/row codeword sub data rows 2 to 4), the erasure position information being obtained at a time of performing Reed-Solomon decoding on the Reed-Solomon-coded data (Col. 3, lines 41-47 in Marchant teaches that configuring/flagging with erasure position information occurs during inner decoding; Note: in cross interleaved codewords, inner decoding occurs before deinterleaving, e.g., Figure 2 in the Kobayashi teaching reference): and

performing error correction on the error correction target code line (col. 6, lines 28-56 in Marchant).

Sub data 48a and 48b in Figure 7 of Marchant is sync data for configuring/flagging erasures.

As per additional limitations in claim 38: Col. 3, lines 41-47 in Marchant teaches that configuring/flagging with erasure position information occurs during inner decoding prior to de-interleaving.

However Marchant does not explicitly teach the specific use of erasure position information being obtained from a position polynomial. **Note: col. 3, lines 41-59 in Marchant teaches that C1 inner codeword rows exceeding error correction capabilities are flagged. An erasure flagged row within a C2 column outer code codeword is a position of an erroneous symbol within the C2 column outer code codeword. Hence, the erasure flag in Marchant provides error position information for a symbol within a C2 column/outer code codeword.**

Nakamura, in an analogous art, teaches the erasure position information being obtained from a position polynomial (**Col. 6, line 51 to col. 7, line 9 and Figure 5 in Nakamura teaches that during C1 inner decoding error location/position polynomials are generated in Block 3 and are used to generate feedback information to generate erasure information in Blocks 7, 7(b), 7(c) and 8; Specifically, col. 7, lines 2-5 in Nakamura teaches that error locations of the C1 inner/row error location/position polynomial are converted to erasure locations to be used in C2 outer/column error correction decoding whenever uncorrectable-error flags are output to**

Blocks 7, 7(b), 7(c) and 8, that is; the erasure position/location information stored in Block 8 is obtained from a error/position polynomial).

In summary, col. 6, line 61 to col. 7, line 8 in Nakamura teach that error locations of the C1 inner/row error location/position polynomial are converted to erasure locations to be used in C2 outer/column error correction decoding whenever uncorrectable-error flags are output to Blocks 7, 7(b), 7(c) and 8, which is substantially what is already taught in Marchant. Col. 6, line 6-17 of Marchant clearly suggests the use of a Reed-Solomon Erasure code. Nakamura teaches that in Reed-Solomon Erasure decoding erasures are erasure flagged during C1 inner/row code decoding just as in Marchant. However, Nakamura provides details missing in Marchant as to how erasure flagging is executed. Col. 6, line 51 to col. 7, line 9 and Figure 5 in Nakamura teaches that during C1 inner decoding error location/position polynomials are generated in Block 3 and are used to generate feedback information to generate erasure information in Blocks 7, 7(b), 7(c) and 8. Specifically, col. 7, lines 2-5 in Nakamura teaches that error locations of the C1 inner/row error location/position polynomial are converted to erasure locations to be used in C2 outer/column error correction decoding whenever uncorrectable-error flags are output to Blocks 7, 7(b), 7(c) and 8, that is; the erasure position/location information stored in Block 8 is obtained from a error/position polynomial).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Marchant with the teachings of Nakamura by including

use of erasure position information being obtained from a position polynomial. This modification would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, because one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that use of erasure position information being obtained from a position polynomial would have provided a means for obtaining erasure information for inner C1 uncorrectable errors (col. 6, line 51 to col. 7, line 9 and Figure 5 in Nakamura).

However Marchant does not explicitly teach the specific use of a typical DVD recording data structure as encompassed in the language "wherein the ECC block includes a plurality of main data areas comprising the plurality of bytes of main data of the error correction target code line and the plurality of bytes of main data of the previous error correction target code line, and a plurality of sub data areas comprising the plurality of bytes of sub data, wherein the plurality of main data areas include a first main data area and a second main data area, wherein the plurality of sub data areas include: a first sub data area in which the first byte of sub data is located; a second sub data area in which the second byte of sub data is located; and a third sub data area in which a third byte of sub data is located, wherein the first main data area is disposed between the first sub data area and the second sub data area, wherein the second main data area is disposed between the second sub data area and the third sub data area wherein the second sub data area is disposed between the first main data area and the second main data area, and wherein said error correction target code line extends so as to be located in both of the first and second main data areas of the ECC block".

Shutoku, in an analogous art, teaches use of a typical DVD recording data structure as encompassed in the language "wherein the ECC block includes a plurality of main data areas comprising the plurality of bytes of main data of the error correction target code line and the plurality of bytes of main data of the previous error correction target code line, and a plurality of sub data areas comprising the plurality of bytes of sub data, wherein the plurality of main data areas include a first main data area and a second main data area, wherein the plurality of sub data areas include: a first sub data area in which the first byte of sub data is located; a second sub data area in which the second byte of sub data is located; and a third sub data area in which a third byte of sub data is located, wherein the first main data area is disposed between the first sub data area and the second sub data area, wherein the second main data area is disposed between the second sub data area and the third sub data area wherein the second sub data area is disposed between the first main data area and the second main data area, and wherein said error correction target code line extends so as to be located in both of the first and second main data areas of the ECC block" (Figure 1-3 and col. 8, lines 52-55 in Shutoku).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Marchant with the teachings of Shutoku by including use of a typical DVD recording data structure as encompassed in the language "wherein the ECC block includes a plurality of main data areas comprising the plurality of bytes of main data of the error correction target code line and the plurality of bytes of main data of the previous error correction target code line, and a plurality of sub data areas

comprising the plurality of bytes of sub data, wherein the plurality of main data areas include a first main data area and a second main data area, wherein the plurality of sub data areas include: a first sub data area in which the first byte of sub data is located; a second sub data area in which the second byte of sub data is located; and a third sub data area in which a third byte of sub data is located, wherein the first main data area is disposed between the first sub data area and the second sub data area, wherein the second main data area is disposed between the second sub data area and the third sub data area wherein the second sub data area is disposed between the first main data area and the second main data area, and wherein said error correction target code line extends so as to be located in both of the first and second main data areas of the ECC block". This modification would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, because one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that use of a typical DVD recording data structure as encompassed in the language "wherein the ECC block includes a plurality of main data areas comprising the plurality of bytes of main data of the error correction target code line and the plurality of bytes of main data of the previous error correction target code line, and a plurality of sub data areas comprising the plurality of bytes of sub data, wherein the plurality of main data areas include a first main data area and a second main data area, wherein the plurality of sub data areas include: a first sub data area in which the first byte of sub data is located; a second sub data area in which the second byte of sub data is located; and a third sub data area in which a third byte of sub data is located, wherein the first main data area is disposed between the first sub data area and the second sub data

area, wherein the second main data area is disposed between the second sub data area and the third sub data area wherein the second sub data area is disposed between the first main data area and the second main data area, and wherein said error correction target code line extends so as to be located in both of the first and second main data areas of the ECC block" would have provided scratch protection for DVDs.

Claims 21 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marchant; Alan B. (US 6631492 B2) in further view of Nakamura; Takahiko et al. (US 5684810 A, hereafter referred to as Nakamura) and Kobayashi; Hisashi et al. (US 6029264 A, hereafter referred to as Kobayashi; Note: Kobayashi is used strictly as a teaching reference) in further view of Eachus; Joseph J. (US 3685016 A).

35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claims 21 and 26.

Marchant and Nakamura substantially teaches the claimed invention described in claims 17-20, 22-25, 27-30 and 32-35 (as rejected above).

However Marchant and Nakamura does not explicitly teach the specific use of avoiding error correction when error correction capabilities are exceeded.

Eachus, in an analogous art, teaches use of avoiding error correction when error correction capabilities are exceeded (col. 13, lines 1-10 in Eachus).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Marchant and Nakamura with the teachings of Eachus by including use of avoiding error correction when error correction capabilities are

exceeded. This modification would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, because one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that use of avoiding error correction when error correction capabilities are exceeded would have provided means for avoiding meaningless calculations (col. 13, lines 1-10 in Eachus).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph D. Torres whose telephone number is (571) 272-3829. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Scott T. Baderman can be reached on (571) 272-3644. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Joseph D Torres
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2112

/Joseph D Torres/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2112